

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/913,621	08/15/2001	Herbert A. Gartner	44484	3856	
109	7590 10/16/2003		EXAMINER		
	CHEMICAL COMPANY	EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI			
P. O. BOX 19	UAL PROPERTY SECTION 167	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	MI 48641-1967		1713		
			DATE MAILED: 10/16/200	3	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

						φ			
		Ap	Application No.		Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summers			)/913,621		GARTNER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary		Ex	aminer		Art Unit				
			Kelechi C. Eg		1713				
Period for I	The MAILING DATE of this commu Reply	ncation appears	on the cove	r sheet with the d	correspondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status									
	Responsive to communication(s) f	iled on 09 June	2003						
· _	This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	2b)⊠ This ac		inal .		•			
· '	·	. /—			rosecution as to the	e merite is			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  Disposition of Claims									
4)⊠ C	laim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the	application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-12</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
5)□ C	laim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ C	laim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.		•						
7)□ C	laim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)□ C	laim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or ele	ction require	ment.					
Application Papers									
9)[] Th	e specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.									
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.									
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.									
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120									
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).									
a) All b) Some * c) None of:									
1.	☐ Certified copies of the priority	documents ha	ve been rece	eived.	•				
2.	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
14)⊠ Ack	knowledgment is made of a claim	for domestic pri	ority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119(	e) (to a provisional	application).			
	☐ The translation of the foreign la knowledgment is made of a claim		• •						
Attachment(s									
2) Notice of 3) Information	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Ition Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)		4)		y (PTO-413) Paper No( Patent Application (PT0				
U.S. Patent and Trade PTOL-326 (Rev.		Office Action	Summary		Part of	f Paper No. 6			

Application/Control Number: 09/913,621 Page 2

Art Unit: 1713

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-8 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner has not rejected claim 11 as being anticipated or obvious and the issue of obviousness or anticipation is not yet decided. Applicant also argued that the issue of unit of invention was not questioned during the international stage of prosecution. This is not found persuasive because a written restriction requirement in a 371 national stage case, citing lack of unity, need not include a rejection of the claims in order to be valid. Also, lack of unity of invention can be raised at anytime during prosecution, including the national stage of prosecution. The Examiner is not precluded from citing a lack of unity, simply because it was not cited in the international stage of prosecution.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 9-11 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR
 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 09/913,621

Art Unit: 1713

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. (4,339,371) or Nagasuna et al. (USPN 4,973,632).
- 6. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collette et al. (USPN 5,994,419) or Kitagawa (USPN 6,048,908)

Each of Robinson et al., Nagasuna et al., Collette et al. or Kitagawa teach the claimed process comprising polymerizing hydrophilic monomer in an aqueous phase with an initiator in a water in oil emulsion, wherein the emulsions are applied to substrate, allowed to dry/cure with heat.

While Robinson et al., Nagasuna et al., Collette et al. or Kitagawa may not explicitly recite the "high internal phase " of the emulsions, it is reasonable that the

Application/Control Number: 09/913,621

Art Unit: 1713

emulsions of Robinson et al., Nagasuna et al., Collette et al. or Kitagawa would process the presently claimed properties since the process of Robinson et al., Nagasuna et al., Collette et al. or Kitagawa are essentially the same as the claimed process and the USPTO does not have at its disposal the tools or facilities deemed necessary to make physical determinations of the sort. In any event, an otherwise old process is not patentable regardless of any new or unexpected properties of the product. In re Fitzgerald et al., 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112 - § 2112.02.

Even if assuming that the prior art references do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 102, it would still have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to arrive at the same inventive process because the disclosure of the inventive subject matter appears within the generic disclosure of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim whose telephone number is (703) 306-5701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (703) 308-2450. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 1713

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

KELECHI C. EGWIM PH.D.

KCE

Ţ